

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8, 15, and 17-18 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-18 are pending and under consideration.

I. Interview

Appreciation is expressed to the Examiner for the telephone interview with the undersigned granted by the Examiner on October 4, 2007. During the interview, further amending the independent claims, especially claims 1 and 8, to overcome the cited prior art was discussed. More specifically, the possibility of amending the independent claims to more definitely recite the feature of generating purchase identification information that uniquely identifies each set of purchase information that is input by the first person was discussed, with respect to the Ananian reference. Accordingly, Applicant has submitted the following amendments and remarks in accordance with this discussion. Other points raised during the interview are also included in the comments below.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, at pages 4-8, claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10, 12-13, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ananian (U.S. Patent No. 7,013,290).

Ananian does not discuss or suggest:

a registration unit that generates purchase identification information that uniquely identifies the first purchase information and associates the unique purchase identification information with a second person;

a storage unit that stores the unique purchase identification information;

and

a searching unit that searches the storage unit for the first purchase information based on receiving the unique purchase identification information as a search condition from the second person,

as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of claim 1 provides for *generating purchase identification information* that *uniquely* identifies each set of purchase information that is input by the first person. In turn, the second person can access the first purchase information by use of the generated purchase identification information, which is provided by the second

person as a *search condition*. In this manner, each set of purchase information can be *uniquely identified by its own purchase identification information* and access can be granted to the second person through use of purchase identification information that is provided to the second person and used by the second person as a *search condition*. Ananian, as relied upon by the Examiner, merely provides that a user can share one or more catalog items with another user, allowing catalog groupings to move freely from one account or device to another. Ananian concedes that these features would require a mutual agreement between users to share personal catalog selections. Therefore, Ananian fails to disclose generating purchase identification information that uniquely identifies Each set of specific purchase information input by a first person. Furthermore, Ananian does not provide for a second person to access the purchase information by providing the unique purchase identification information as a search condition.

Since Ananian does not discuss or suggest all of the features of claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Ananian. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-6 and 16 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. Therefore, claims 3-6 and 16 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(b) rejections is respectfully requested.

Ananian does not discuss or suggest:

generating purchase identification information that uniquely identifies the first purchase information and associates the unique purchase identification information with a second person;

storing the unique purchase identification information;

receiving the unique purchase identification information as a search condition from the second person;

and

searching the storage unit for the first purchase information based on the search condition,

as recited in claims 8 and 15. Therefore, claims 8 and 15 patentably distinguish over Ananian. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(e) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 12-13 depend either directly or indirectly from amended claim 8, and include all the features of claim 8, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested

by the reference relied upon. Therefore, claims 10 and 12-13 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(e) rejections is respectfully requested.

Ananian does not discuss or suggest:

a registration unit that generates purchase identification information that uniquely identifies the first purchase information and associates the unique purchase identification information with a second person;

a storage unit that stores the unique purchase identification information; and

a creation unit that creates second purchase information concerning an item to be purchased by a second person, based on the first purchase information obtained, as a result of receiving the unique purchase identification information as a search condition from the second person,

as recited in amended claim 17. Therefore, claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Ananian. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Ananian does not discuss or suggest:

generating purchase identification information that uniquely identifies the first purchase information and associates the unique purchase identification information with a second person;

receiving the unique purchase identification information as a search condition from a second person;

and

searching for the first purchase information corresponding to the search condition,

as recited in amended claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Ananian. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 8-9, claims 7, 11, and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ananian in view of Greef (U.S. Patent No. 6,032,129).

As discussed above, Ananian does not discuss or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Greef fails to make up for these deficiencies. Specifically, Greef does not discuss or suggest:

a registration unit that generates purchase identification information that uniquely identifies the first purchase information and associates the unique purchase identification information with a second person;

a storage unit that stores the unique purchase identification information;

and

a searching unit that searches the storage unit for the first purchase information based on receiving the unique purchase identification information as a search condition from the second person,

as recited in claim 1. Claim 7 depends indirectly from claim 1 and includes all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Greef does not discuss or suggest

generating purchase identification information that uniquely identifies the first purchase information and associates the unique purchase identification information with a second person;

storing the unique purchase identification information;

receiving the unique purchase identification information as a search condition from the second person;

and

searching the storage unit for the first purchase information based on the search condition,

as recited in amended claim 8. Claims 11 and 14 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 8 and include all the features of claim 8, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 11 and 14 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/729,897

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10-5-07

By: 

Aaron C. Walker
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501